

## REMARKS

Claims 1 to 30 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner during the telephone conference of September 23, 2004, in which the claim language directed towards "signal display" and "visual image" was discussed. The Examiner has provided an Interview Summary dated October 6, 2004.

Applicants further appreciate the Examiner's indication that claims 7, 9-14, 19, and 21-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1-3, 6, 15, 18, 27, and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Monroe (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0169335). The Examiner stated essentially that Monroe teaches all the limitations of claims 1-3, 6, 15, 18, 27, and 29.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "a display unit for displaying the signal pattern as a visual image pattern; a display unit controller for controlling position and orientation of said display unit." Claim 3 claims, *inter alia*, "visually transmitting the visual image pattern through free space from the display unit of said signal transmitting device; receiving the visual image pattern using the visual recording device of said signal receiving device." Claim 15 claims, *inter alia*, "acquiring, visually, an image of the visual image pattern displayed by the display unit using the visual recording device." Claim 27 recites, *inter alia*, "a display unit for displaying the visual signal pattern generated by said generated signal template; and a display unit controller for controlling a position and an orientation of said display unit relative to a signal receiving device,

wherein the visual signal pattern is visible to the signal receiving device.” Claim 29 claims, *inter alia*, “a visual recording device for visually determining a visual image pattern of a display unit, wherein the visual image pattern is a visual pattern of blobs.”

Monroe teaches a ground based security system for aircraft (see Abstract). Monroe teaches that a camera, either installed in the aircraft or on the ground, may be controlled by a ground based system for monitoring purposes (see paragraphs [0074] and [0092]).

Referring to claims 1 and 27, Monroe teaches that a camera has pan and tilt capabilities (see Figures 3B and 5 and paragraphs [0074] and [0076-0080]). Monroe teaches that ground-based monitors display images captured by the camera located within an aircraft (see paragraph [0097]). Monroe does not teach “a display unit controller for controlling position and orientation of said display unit” as claimed in claim 1 or “a display unit controller for controlling a position and an orientation of said display unit relative to a signal receiving device, wherein the visual signal pattern is visible to the signal receiving device” as claimed in claim 27. Monroe teaches that a camera is controlled. Monroe does not teach or suggest that a display’s position and orientation is controlled. A camera is not analogous to a display unit as claimed in claims 1 and 27. The display unit controller changes the position and orientation of the display unit to establish visual communication with the visual recording device, such that the visual recording device detects and decodes the visual image pattern displayed by the display unit (see claim 1) or such that the visual signal pattern displayed by the display unit is visible to the signal receiving device (see claim 27). Monroe does not teach control of a display. Thus, Monroe does not teach “a signal display controller for controlling position and orientation of said signal display” as claimed in claim 1 or “a signal display controller for controlling a position and an orientation of

said signal display” as claimed in claim 27. Therefore, Monroe fails to teach all the limitations of claims 1 and 27.

Referring to claims 3, 15 and 29, Monroe teaches wireless communication of digital signals from a camera in an aircraft to a base station (see paragraph [0074]). Monroe does not teach “visually transmitting the visual image pattern through free space from the display unit of said signal transmitting device; receiving the visual image pattern using the visual recording device of said signal receiving device” as claimed in claim 3, “acquiring, visually, an image of the visual image pattern displayed by the display unit using the visual recording device” as claimed in claim 15 or “a visual recording device for visually determining a visual image pattern of a display unit, wherein the visual image pattern is a visual pattern of blobs” as claimed in claim 29. Monroe’s transmission of a digital signal from a camera to a base station (see paragraph [0074]) is not analogous to a communication from a display unit to a visual recording device, essentially as claimed in claims 3, 15 and 29. Monroe teaches a camera capturing a view of an aircraft (see Abstract) and transmitting wireless signals to a base station for display (see Figure 3a). Monroe does not teach a camera having a view of a visual image pattern displayed on a display unit. Thus, Monroe does not teach visually determining a visual image pattern of a display unit, essentially as claimed in claims 3, 15 and 29. Therefore, Monroe fails to teach all the limitations of claims 3, 15 and 29.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claim 6 depends from claim 3. Claim 18 depends from claims 15. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for claims 1, 3 and 15, respectively. The Examiner’s reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.


Claims 4, 5, 8, 16, 17, 20, 28, and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Monroe, and further in view of Rhoads (U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0005093). The Examiner stated essentially that the combined teachings of Monroe and Rhoads teach or suggest all the limitations of claims 4, 5, 8, 16, 17, 20, 28, and 30.

Claims 4, 5 and 8 depend from claim 3. Claims 16, 17, and 20 depend from claim 15. Claims 28 and 30 depend from claim 27. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for the respective independent claims. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including claims 1 to 30, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

  
Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Mailing Address:  
**F. Chau & Associates, LLP**  
300 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, NY 11797  
Tel: (516) 692-8888  
Fax: (516) 692-8889